

access

SPECIAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2012

10:00 - 11:30 A.M.

The California Endowment Center

Redwood Room

1000 North Alameda Street

Los Angeles CA 90012

MISSION STATEMENT

Access Services promotes access to all modes of transportation and provides quality and safe ADA paratransit service on behalf of public transit agencies in Los Angeles County.

	<u>DISPOSITION</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	ACTION
2. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	INFORMATION
3. COMPLEMENTARY ADA PARATRANSIT PLAN UPDATE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2013 (page) [Staff Recommendation: request that Members consider and ratify the following fare schedule, which would start on January 1, 2013 (see item for details)]	PRESENTATION/ ACTION [Vote required: majority of each of two of three classes of members present in person or by proxy]
4. NEW BUSINESS SUBSEQUENT TO THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA	DISCUSSION/ POSSIBLE ACTION
5. ADJOURNMENT	ACTION

Access Services does not discriminate on the basis of disability. Accordingly, Access Services seeks to ensure that individuals with disabilities will have an equal opportunity to participate in the range of Access Services events and programs by providing appropriate auxiliary aids and services to facilitate communication. In determining the type of auxiliary aids and services for communication that will be

provided, primary consideration is given to the request of the individual with disabilities. However, the final decision belongs to Access Services. To help ensure availability of those auxiliary aids and services you require, please make every effort to notify Access Services of your request at least three (3) business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting in which you wish to utilize those aids or services. You may do so by contacting (213) 270-6000.

Note: Access Services board meetings are held pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act [Cal. Gov. Code §54950] and are open to the public. The public may view and obtain all written information supporting this agenda provided to the board both initially and supplementally prior to the meeting at the agency's offices located at 3449 Santa Anita Avenue, El Monte California and on its website at <http://asila.org>. Documents, including Power Point handouts distributed to Board Members by staff or Board members at the meeting will simultaneously be made available to the public. Three opportunities are available for the public to address the board during a board meeting: (1) before closed session regarding matters to be discussed in closed session, (2) before a specific agenda item is debated and voted upon regarding that item and (3) general public comment. The exercise of the right to address the board is subject to restriction as to time and appropriate decorum. All persons wishing to make public comment must fill out a yellow Public Comment Form and submit it to the Secretary to the Board. Public comment is generally limited to three (3) minutes per speaker and the total time available for public comment may be limited at the discretion of the Chairperson. Persons whose speech is impaired such that they are unable to address the board at a normal rate of speed may request the accommodation of a limited amount of additional time from the Chair but only by checking the appropriate box on the Public Comment Form. Granting such an accommodation is in the discretion of the Chair.

The Board of Directors will not and cannot respond during the meeting to matters raised under general public comment. Pursuant to provisions of the Brown Act governing these proceedings, no discussion or action may be taken on these matters unless they are listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. However, the board may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future Board of Directors Meeting and the staff will respond to all public comment in writing prior to the next board meeting.

"Alternative accessible formats available upon request."

NOVEMBER 8, 2012

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: ANDRE COLAIACE, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

RE: COMPLEMENTARY ADA PARATRANSIT PLAN UPDATE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2013

ISSUE:

Because of increased ridership and higher gas prices, Access Services faces financial difficulties in future years. It is anticipated that budget shortfalls will total \$5.7 million in FY2013/14 (which includes \$2.8 million in vehicle replacements deferred from the FY2012/13 budget) and approximately \$3.1 million in FY 2014/15. In order to ensure the Agency moves forward with a balanced budget and a full vehicle replacement program, the Board has forwarded the following proposal for fare increase to the Members for ratification.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff is requesting that Members consider and ratify the following fare schedule, which would start on January 1, 2013:

Proposed Fare Change

L.A. Basin	Current	January 1, 2013	July 1, 2014
0 - 20 Miles	\$2.25	\$2.50	\$2.75
Over 20 Miles	\$3.00	\$3.25	\$3.50

Transfer and North County fares will remain the same

North County	Local Fare	Transfer Fare
Santa Clarita	\$2.00	\$6.00
Antelope Valley	\$2.00	\$7.00
Between Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley	n/a	\$7.00

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

Staff believes the budget shortfalls projected through FY 2014/15 can be resolved by implementing the proposed fare adjustments.

BACKGROUND:

Fare Change Analysis

Demand projections, using the current fare structure, were conducted by HDR Decision Economics earlier in the year and showed a 6.1% ridership increase in FY2013/14 and a 5.8% increase in FY2014/15. Part of the growth can be attributed to higher than average unemployment rates for L.A. County, continued high gasoline prices and the reduction of other transportation options on a regional and local level. High unemployment and gasoline prices encourage riders to use low-cost transportation alternatives such as public fixed route and ADA paratransit.

After Board approval in June, staff worked with HDR to conduct an analysis of various fare scenarios. Staff is proposing the scenario that had the least fiscal impact on our customers while also balancing the Agency's budget through FY 14/15.

Federal Title VI Analysis

Federal regulations require that Access conduct a Title VI analysis of its proposed fare change to determine whether the proposal will have a disparate impact on minority or low-income customers of Access. The analysis demonstrated that Access' proposed fare change would not result in a disparate impact on minority or low-income customers because it was being implemented in a slow, phased-in manner and, in addition, there were other less expensive and free alternatives available.

CAC and TPAC

The proposal was brought to both advisory committees twice for comment. At the October meetings, both the CAC and TPAC voted unanimously to support the fare proposal.

Public Outreach

As part of this process, staff conducted extensive outreach throughout the County to ensure Access customers were able to provide input regarding the proposed fare changes. During August and September, Access held 11 Community Meetings throughout its service area and one Public Hearing on October 3rd in the Metro Boardroom.

In addition, staff mailed newsletters to all active riders, distributed over 5,000 seat drops, and published public hearing notices in five major newspapers to advertise the proposed fare changes. Staff also encouraged community input by soliciting comments through e-mail, a dedicated phone line, and via an on-line survey. Lastly, the proposal was sent to local, state and federal political offices.

Staff has summarized the comments below:

Comments received via telephone, e-mail, letters and Public Hearing

Phone	173	75%
Hearing	31	13%
E-mail	27	12%
Letter	1	
Total	232	100%

Fare Increase

Support	143	75%
Oppose	45	24%
Neutral	2	1%
Total	190	100%

Online Survey

Of the 186 respondents who completed the online survey, 68% understood that a higher fare is necessary to keep premium services intact:

Question 1: Do you support an increase in fares in order to keep the premium services that are currently offered by Access?

Yes	128	68%
No	58	32%
Total	186	100%

Question 2: Would you prefer to have a smaller fare increase and eliminate some premium services instead?

Yes	44	24%
No	142	76%

Total 186 100%
Community Meetings Input

During August and September, eleven Community Meetings were held across Los Angeles County. Two meetings were held in the Santa Clarita, Northern, Eastern, West/Central, and Southern regions, and one in Antelope Valley. Of the 60 people who attended the meetings, 13 spoke in support of the proposed fare changes and 12 were opposed. 31 people voiced miscellaneous comments unrelated to the proposal. The remaining attendees did not comment.

Phone	173	93%
Meeting	31	17%
Email	23	12%
Other	1	1%
Total	237	100%

Region	143	73%
Oppose	42	24%
Neutral	2	1%
Total	187	100%

Yes	128	68%
No	58	32%
Total	186	100%

Yes	44	24%
No	142	76%

access

AGENDA

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING

Tuesday, November 13, 2012

1:00pm - 3:00pm

Los Angeles County MTA

Union Station Conference Room, 3rd Floor

One Gateway Plaza,

729 Vignes Street, Los Angeles CA 90012

Time	Item	Item Description	Disposition	Pages
	1.	Call to Order	Action	
10	2.	Introductions		
	3.	Review & Approval of Minutes of October 9, 2012	Action	4-16
10	4.	General Public Comment	Information	
15	5.	Report from Board of Directors	Information	
20	6.	Go 511 Update	Presentation	
15	7.	Outreach Subcommittee Formation	Action	17-18
15	8.	Member Communication		
	9.	New Business Raised Subsequent to the Posting of the Agenda	Possible Action	

ACCESS SERVICES DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF DISABILITY. ACCORDINGLY, ACCESS SERVICES SEEKS TO ENSURE THAT INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WILL HAVE AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RANGE OF ACCESS SERVICES EVENTS AND PROGRAMS BY PROVIDING APPROPRIATE AUXILIARY AIDS AND SERVICES TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION. IN DETERMINING THE TYPE OF AUXILIARY AIDS AND SERVICES FOR COMMUNICATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED, PRIMARY CONSIDERATION IS GIVEN TO THE REQUEST OF THE INDIVIDUAL WITH DISABILITIES. HOWEVER, THE FINAL DECISION BELONGS TO ACCESS SERVICES. TO HELP ENSURE AVAILABILITY OF THOSE AUXILIARY AIDS AND SERVICES YOU REQUIRE, PLEASE MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO NOTIFY ACCESS SERVICES OF YOUR REQUEST AT LEAST THREE (3) BUSINESS DAYS (72 HOURS) PRIOR TO THE MEETING IN WHICH YOU WISH TO UTILIZE THOSE AIDS OR SERVICES. YOU MAY DO SO BY CONTACTING (213) 270-6000.

Note: Access Services Community Advisory (CAC) meetings are held pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act [Cal. Gov. Code §54950] and are open to the public. The public may view and obtain all written information supporting this agenda provided to the board both initially and supplementally prior to the meeting at the agency's offices located at 3449 Santa Anita Avenue, El Monte California and on its website at <http://asila.org>. Documents, including Power Point handouts distributed to CAC by staff or CAC members at the meeting will simultaneously be made available to the public. Two opportunities are available for the public to address the CAC during a CAC meeting: (1) before a specific agenda item is debated and voted upon regarding that item and (2) general public comment. The exercise of the right to address the board is subject to restriction as to time and appropriate decorum. All persons wishing to make public

comment must fill out a yellow Public Comment Form and submit it to the CAC secretary. Public comment is generally limited to three (3) minutes per speaker and the total time available for public comment may be limited at the discretion of the Chairperson. Persons whose speech is impaired such that they are unable to address the board at a normal rate of speed may request the accommodation of a limited amount of additional time from the Chair but only by checking the appropriate box on the Public Comment Form. Granting such an accommodation is in the discretion of the Chair.

The CAC will not and cannot respond during the meeting to matters raised under general public comment. Pursuant to provisions of the Brown Act governing these proceedings, no discussion or action may be taken on these matters unless they are listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. However, the CAC may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future CAC Meeting.

"Alternative accessible formats available upon request."

MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting

Tuesday October 9, 2012

1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Arrigo called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

CAC Members Present: Maria Aroch, Michael Anthony Arrigo, Dov Cohen, Phyllis Coto, Tina Fofoa, Howard Payne, Freddi Segal-Gidan and Nan Stoudenmire.

CAC Members Absent: Kurt Baldwin, Marie-France Francois, Dina Garcia and Terri Lantz.

Board Members Present: None

Access Services Staff: David Foster, Araceli Camuy, Kim Hogarth-Hindi, Hilary Simmons, Nicole Leiva, Lora Verarde, Alfredo Torales, Mark Maloney, Eric Haack and Matthew Avancena.

Guests: Gary Jansen (Access Customer), Bill Zuke (Access Customer), Lupe Medina (Access Customer), Semee Park (Los Angeles City Councilmember Mitchell Englander's Office), David Howie Jones (Care Evaluators), Allison Hughes (R & D Transportation), Jack Garate (Global Paratransit), Francisco Lucas (California Transit), Jesse Padilla (Access Customer/East Los Angeles Regional Center), Hugh Hallenberg (Access Customer/Advocate), Walter Andrade (MV Transportation) and Giovana Gogreve (Metro).

INTRODUCTIONS

Chairperson Arrigo welcomed the members, staff and guests to the meeting and asked that everyone introduce themselves.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF THE CAC MEETING MINUTES FROM AUGUST 14, 2012

Motion: Member Payne moved to approve the minutes of the August 14, 2012 CAC meeting.

Second: Member Segal-Gidan.

Correction: Chairperson Arrigo stated that Item 4 on the agenda showed the approval of the minutes of July 10, 2012 however it should have said minutes of August 14, 2012.

Motion was approved.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Access customer Mr. Gary Jansen expressed his concern about San Gabriel Transit scheduling trips with 3 people in the back seat of a taxi. He stated that the rides were too tight and said that on one occasion another customer told him that he needed to lose weight. He said that possibly requesting a van or riding in the front seat of the taxi would be a better option.

Access customer Mr. Hugh Hallenberg stated that he did not support the proposed fare and service changes. He said that he called several times to comment and experienced long hold times.

REPORT FROM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

None.

PROPOSED FARE AND SERVICES CHANGES

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEM 6

Access customer Mr. Hugh Hallenberg asked if the Customer Service center would close at 5:00 p.m. and inquired about the people who experienced service problems after 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Foster responded that the Customer Service hours have always been 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and explained that the Operations Monitoring Center (OMC) was open 24 hours a day 7 days a week for immediate service issues.

Mr. Hallenberg expressed his concern regarding the fare increase. He stated that he was on a limited income and even a .25 cent increase would be difficult for him. He asked what the cost per trip was and questioned if the funds from the fare increase would make a significant difference to the budget deficit.

Chairperson Arrigo asked that all questions and comments wait until after Mr. Avancena's presentation.

Access Services Manager of Planning and Coordination, Matthew Avancena gave a brief presentation on the proposed fare and service changes. He stated that he presented this item to the CAC at the August meeting and wanted to share the customer feedback and some additional information with the committee.

He began by giving an overview of the agency's financial situation and showed a graph describing the regional ADA paratransit funding from Metro. He stated that Access received funding from Metro and FTA and explained that the Metro's funding had increased 6% annually over the last five years. He said that even with the increased funding, Access projected budget deficits over the next 3 years.

He explained that two of the main contributing factors were increased fuel prices and a significant ridership increase that outpaced the demand projections. He stated that the cutbacks to

state and local transportation programs impacted the service by creating an influx of additional passengers. He said that because of the financial situation, Access was proposing a fare increase of 25 cents to take effect on January 1, 2013 and additional 25 cents in July 2014.

He also stated that if approved by the Board, the fare would go up from \$2.25 to \$2.50 and a year and a half later, it will increase from \$2.50 to \$2.75. He explained that this was Access' 2nd fare increase in the 18 years of operation and said that even with the increase, the fare was reasonable compared to other similar paratransit systems in the nation.

He continued his presentation by stating that in addition to the fare increase, Access was proposing a reservation window change. He stated that the reservation hours would change from 6:00 a.m.-10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. He explained that the reduced reservation hours would allow for more direct routes and accurate pick up times. He said that Access conducted a survey about 6 months ago that included the areas of customer service, ride performance, and vehicle cleanliness. The survey also included the customer's preferred time to make reservations. He explained that the survey results showed that 10% of the customers called after 7:00 p.m. He said that vast majority of the customers called between 7:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. He said that even with the proposed changes, reservations would still be open a total 13 hours.

Mr. Avancena explained that at this time Access was not proposing cuts to any of the premium services like the Free Fare program, the toll free number, or the Operations Monitoring Center (OMC).

He stated that in preparation of the fare increase, staff went through an extensive outreach process which included 11 community meetings and a public hearing. He said that a direct mailing was sent to all "active" riders informing them of the proposed changes and also provided information on how to comment on the changes. He said that in addition, the proposed changes were published in 5 local newspapers including the LA

Times and other multicultural papers. He stated that Access set up a message phone line, an online survey and an email where customers could comment about the changes. He said that the proposed changes were presented to the CAC at the previous meeting as well as to the Transportation Professionals Advisory Committee (TPAC). Lastly, he stated that the local and municipal operators and all political offices in Los Angeles County were also notified of the changes.

He stated that regarding customer feedback, Access had received 27 emails, 169 phone messages, 174 online survey respondents, 60 community meeting attendants and 37 public hearing comments. He mentioned that the customer comments could be viewed online.

He stated that 82% of the customers who commented supported the fare increase and 17% opposed it. He said that in terms of the reservation window, 46% supported the reservations window time and 44% opposed it. He mentioned that approximately 10% of the customers preferred that the reservation time be pushed back to 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

He concluded his presentation by stating that staff would present the proposal to the board at the October 22, 2012 meeting. He said that if approved by the board and the member agencies, the changes would go into effect on January 1, 2013 and July 1, 2014.

Member Aroch stated that she attended 2 Community Meetings and found that there was very low attendance. She asked if the meetings were expensive and if Access paid rental fees.

Mr. Avancena responded that all the locations hosted the Community Meetings for free except for the Encino location.

Member Coto asked about the possibility of donating 2 or 3 free ride coupons per month to low income seniors for their doctor's appointments. She stated that she agreed with the proposed changes and supported the reservation time change. She suggested the hours to be from 7:00 or 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. or 9:00 p.m.

Member Cohen stated that he attended the Public Hearing and commented on the proposed changes. He said that based on the comments heard, it seemed that the majority preferred the reservation hours to start later and close later. He suggested that Access look at those options. He also asked, why delay the changes until July if there was an immediate need for the funds.

Mr. Avancena responded that the proposed reservation time change was set for July to give the customers ample notice.

Access Operations Officer, Mr. Mark Maloney stated that Access was currently working on an automated reservation system that would eventually allow reservations to be made 24 hours a day 7 days a week.

Mr. Foster stated that the board would include the community's feedback to determine the reservation window times. He explained that the 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. reservation time was proposed in order for the rides to be more accurately routed and for providers to callback the customers with a more exact pick up time.

Member Cohen stated that the public may not be aware of the reasons for the proposed changes and said that it was important for the community to know all of the facts.

Member Segal-Gidan commended Access for a reasonable and restrained approach considering the increased ridership demand and fuels costs. She stated that she understood the economic situation for persons on limited income however said that maybe a more aggressive but reasonable approach was necessary in order to generate more income and lessen the deficit.

Mr. Avancena responded that staff worked with a consultant to come up with a balanced approach on how to increase fares at a financially responsible level without causing hardship for the customers.

Member Segal-Gidan suggested that the numbers be presented in terms of the savings from the proposed changes to better support the proposal.

Member Coto asked if there were any fundraising options for persons with low income.

Member Payne suggested that fundraising opportunities be looked into by individual programs or centers for their clients.

Chairperson Arrigo supported the idea that free coupons be given to persons with low income for doctor's appointments.

Member Aroch stated that it would require time and money for Access to identify the low income customers and support a fundraising project.

Mr. Foster explained that Access was a public transportation program and just like the bus, required all passengers to pay a fare. He said that it was up to the individual organizations to fundraise on behalf of their customers.

Member Fofoa stated that she supported the fare increase and stated that customers should look into other transportation options besides Access. She said that she frequently travelled on Long Beach Transit, Metro rail and buses on the Free Fare program.

Mr. Hallenberg asked how many people scheduled rides between 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m.

Mr. Avancena responded that he did not have the exact numbers but based on the survey results, approximately 40% of the calls were made between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m.

Member Cohen asked what the average ridership per day was and the total number of surveys conducted.

Mr. Maloney responded that the average daily ridership was approximately 9000.

Mr. Avancena responded that there were 1200 surveys.

Member Cohen expressed his concern regarding the amount of surveys and asked if 1200 was a fair representation of the ridership.

Mr. Avancena responded that staff wanted to make sure that the data captured was a valid sample that reflected the opinion of the customers. He said that the consultant firm were experts in polling and had 20 years of experience including working on presidential campaigns. He said that according to the consultant, the surveys were a statistically valid sample that accurately reflected the thoughts of the customers.

Member Segal-Gidan suggested that staff provide data of a random sampling of calls per hour to better support the survey results.

Mr. Foster stated that from his experience working with the operations department and with providers, he found that most people called between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m.

Access customer Mr. William Zuke expressed his concern regarding the proposed reservation hours. He asked if staff had conducted a survey of how the changes would affect the customers who call after 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Avancena responded that staff had not conducted a survey specifically for persons who had issues with the proposed reservation hours. He explained that Community Meetings, a Public Hearing and others resources were made available for Access to receive the customer's feedback. Lastly, he stated that close to 300 comments were received.

Member Coto asked if everyone received the notices.

Mr. Hallenberg stated that he did not receive any information in the mail except for the newsletter.

Mr. Avancena responded that the mailing was sent to all riders that had used the service at least once in the past six months. He stated there were approximately 40,000 active riders.

Mr. Maloney advised Mr. Hallenberg that staff would check to see why he was not receiving the correspondence.

Chairperson Arrigo asked the committee if they wanted to take action on the item.

Motion: Member Coto made a motion to approve the proposed fare increase and service changes.

Second: Member Segal-Gidan.

Discussion: Member Payne asked that the motion on the floor be reinstated.

Member Cohen suggested that the items be voted on separately. He asked if the committee was voting for the proposed reservation hours or for a 13 hour reservation window with the hours to be determined by the board.

A discussion ensued and the committee agreed to vote on the items separately.

Motion: Member Coto made a motion to approve the proposed fare increase from \$2.25 to \$2.50.

Second: Member Segal-Gidan.

Discussion: Member Segal-Gidan stated that Member Coto's motion did not include the incremental .25 increase set for July 2014 as per the recommendation.

Motion: Member Coto made a motion to approve the proposed fare increase recommended by staff.

Second: Member Segal-Gidan.

Opposed: None.

Abstentions: None

Pass/Fail: Motion carried.

Motion: Member Segal-Gidan made a motion that the CAC support the reduction in reservation hours from 16 to 13 hours to be determined by the Board of Directors based on what is best for the customers.

Second: Member Payne.

Discussion: A discussion ensued between the members regarding the proposed reservation hours.

Pass/Fail: Motion carried.

ACCESS CALL CENTER ENHANCEMENTS

Access Services Manager of Customer Support Services, David Foster gave a brief update on the call center's progress over the past year. He stated that next month it would be 1 year since he began to oversee Customer Support Services. He explained that prior to that, he worked in the Operations Department.

He continued his presentation by stating that Access had been working on improving several aspects of the call center including quality assurance, monitoring calls and observations. He stated that hold times seemed to be an on-going issue that staff was working on.

He showed a chart that displayed the average monthly call volume and hold times from 2009 to present. He stated that the call volume continued to be high and stated that some of the contributing factors were the decrease in other transit systems,

increase in application requests, Access/Tap card implementation and no expansion capabilities for the existing call center. He also reviewed customer complaints and stated that there was a dramatic decrease in complaints in the past 2 years.

He stated some of the strategies that were implemented to improve the Customer Support Center were:

- Callback feature was implemented to the TAP and Customer Service queue
- Website application option
- Temporary employees were hired
- Assistance from Access staff from other departments
- San Gabriel Transit handling weekend and holiday OMC coverage - effective July 1, 2012
- Call outsourcing - effective September 4, 2012

He explained that some of the benefits of outsourcing were managing the incoming call volume, consistently meeting phone hold time standards and better customer service and customer education.

He reviewed a chart that compared the call volume from August 2012 to September 2012 and stated that although the total incoming calls were increasing the hold times were lower. He explained that staff worked hard to keep the Operations Monitoring Center (OMC) hold time below the 5 minute standard.

Mr. Foster concluded his presentation by stating that managing the Customer Service hold time continued to be a challenge but staff was working on ways to try to meet the demand.

Member Segal-Gidan asked how much was the outsourcing costs.

Mr. Foster responded that Access was paying \$1.80 per call rather than paying an hourly rate.

Member Segal-Gidan asked if it would be more cost efficient to take the calls in house.

Mr. Maloney responded that it was cheaper to outsource than to use Access employees.

Mr. Foster explained that the organization was spending a lot of money paying for temps and overtime.

Member Cohen asked if any research had been done regarding the 800 number and asked if customers called a land line instead, would there be savings for the organization.

Mr. Avancena responded that during the last fare increase process, staff looked at the 800 number however based on the community's feedback the toll free line was one of the top services the customers did not want cut.

Member Cohen stated that many people had unlimited calling on their cell phones and suggested that the 800 number be optional for people who chose to use it.

Member Coto asked if the applications were available online and asked if online reservations would be available.

Mr. Maloney responded that applications were available however reservations were not available online at this time.

Mr. Foster stated that customers could file complaints or commendations online.

Member Coto congratulated Mr. Foster on his first year as Customer Support Manager and thanked him for his hard work.

Member Payne asked when the automated reservation system would be available.

Mr. Maloney responded that staff was working to have the system ready by the spring of next year.

MEMBER COMMUNICATION

Member Payne announced that the City of Whittier was hosting an event for persons with disabilities on October 22, 2012 and encouraged everyone to attend. He thanked Alfredo Torales for his assistance with some pick up issues at the Long Beach VA Hospital.

Member Coto complimented the reservations staff for providing kind and friendly service.

Member Cohen thanked the committee for their hard work.

Chairperson Arrigo mentioned the formation of outreach subcommittee and asked the committee for other subcommittee ideas that can be put on the agenda.

Member Payne expressed his concern regarding no-shows and suggested that customers be educated on the impact of no-shows to the service.

NEW BUSINESS RAISED SUBSEQUENT TO POSTING OF AGENDA

Mr. Foster suggested that the no show issue could be a topic for a subcommittee.

Chairperson Arrigo suggested that tours of the provider locations be set up for the CAC members who were interested in visiting.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Member Cohen.

Second: Member Coto.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

OCTOBER 9, 2012

TO: ACCESS COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: DAVID FOSTER, MANAGER OF CUSTOMER SUPPORT SERVICES
RE: OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE

ISSUE:

During the October 2012 CAC meeting, Chairperson, Michael Arrigo suggested that the committee form an Outreach Subcommittee during new business.

RECOMMENDATION:

Subsequent to Chairperson Arrigo providing an overview of the goal and purpose of an Outreach Subcommittee, identify 3-5 individuals willing to service on the committee if the group chooses to move forward with an Outreach Subcommittee.

BACKGROUND:

As Article, Section 1 of the CAC Bylaws outline, the purpose of the CAC is to provide community input and advice to Access Services Board of Directors and staff concerning operational policy issues to impact and improve the Access Services transportation program. Moreover, Article 6, Section 1 outlines the parameters for a subcommittee as follows:

The CAC may establish subcommittees which will be charged with a specific purpose or task.

- 1.1 - Subcommittee membership will be appointed by the CAC.
- 1.2 - Members will include CAC members.
- 1.3 - Members may include non-CAC members who have expertise, insight, knowledge, or specific interest in the specific purpose or task.
- 1.4 - Subcommittees will encourage open discussion and dialogue with all persons attending their meetings.
- 1.5 - All meeting locations shall be posted according to the Brown Act. An Access Services staff person will be assigned to each subcommittee and will attend subcommittee meetings.
- 1.6 - Subcommittees shall report their activities to the CAC on a regular basis. The CAC shall take recommendations under advisement and determine further action, if appropriate.

This language is important to understand when forming and conducting subcommittee because it outlines the role of the CAC and any subcommittees as advisory in nature. Therefore, once a subcommittee is assigned a specific task, the subcommittee makes recommendations to the CAC and in turn the CAC would then make recommendations to the Access Board of Directors.

In this structure, the subcommittee members can rely upon staff to provide the necessary information in order to complete the task of the subcommittee and make appropriate recommendations. The CAC as a whole and the subcommittees created by the CAC, cannot however, take actions under the auspices of the CAC and/or Access Services without prior approval from the Access Board.